

Fiscal Year 2005 Performance Plan

U.S. Department of Education
February 2004

Goals and Objectives

Goal One: Create a Culture of Achievement

- 1.1 Link federal education funding to accountability for results.
- 1.2 Increase flexibility and local control.
- 1.3 Increase information and options for parents.
- 1.4 Encourage the use of scientifically based methods within federal education programs.

Goal Two: Improve Student Achievement

- 2.1 Ensure that all students read on grade level by the third grade.
- 2.2 Improve mathematics and science achievement for all students.
- 2.3 Improve the performance of all high school students.
- 2.4 Improve teacher and principal quality.
- 2.5 Improve U.S. students' knowledge of world languages, regions, and international issues and build international ties in the field of education.

Goal Three: Develop Safe Schools and Strong Character

- 3.1 Ensure that our nation's schools are safe and drug free and that students are free of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs.
- 3.2 Promote strong character and citizenship among our nation's youth.

Goal Four: Transform Education into an Evidence-Based Field

- 4.1 Raise the quality of research funded or conducted by the Department.
- 4.2 Increase the relevance of our research in order to meet the needs of our customers.

Goal Five: Enhance the Quality of and Access to Postsecondary and Adult Education

- 5.1 Reduce the gaps in college access and completion among student populations differing by race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and disability while increasing the educational attainment of all.
- 5.2 Strengthen accountability of postsecondary education institutions.
- 5.3 Establish effective funding mechanisms for postsecondary education.
- 5.4 Strengthen Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-Serving Institutions, and Tribal Colleges and Universities.
- 5.5 Enhance the literacy and employment skills of American adults.
- 5.6 Increase the capacity of U.S. postsecondary education institutions to teach world languages, area studies, and international issues.

Goal Six: Establish Management Excellence

- 6.1 Develop and maintain financial integrity and management and internal controls.
- 6.2 Improve the strategic management of the Department's human capital.
- 6.3 Manage information technology resources, using e-gov, to improve services for our customers and partners.
- 6.4 Modernize the Student Financial Assistance programs and reduce their high-risk status.
- 6.5 Achieve budget and performance integration to link funding decisions to results.
- 6.6 Leverage the contributions of faith-based and community organizations to increase the effectiveness of Department programs.
- 6.7 By becoming a high-performance, customer-focused organization, earn the President's Quality Award.

Goal 1: Create a Culture of Achievement

Objective 1.1: Link federal education funding to accountability for results

Strategies

- A. State NCLB¹ accountability systems
- B. Federal accountability
- C. Performance-based grants
- D. Outcomes-based performance management
- E. Targeted support and outreach
- F. Evaluations informing legislation

Performance Measure

Objective 1.1: Link Federal Education Funding to Accountability for Results							
Measure		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
State Accountability Systems	The percentage of states with final No Child Left Behind accountability systems that are fully implemented.	NA	NA	NA	NA	15	25

NA = Not available

State(s) = States and jurisdictions that are required under NCLB to implement assessment systems; this includes the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

State Accountability Systems

Source. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE), Program files.

Additional Information. For this measure, a complete accountability system includes annual assessments in mathematics and reading for students in grades 3 – 8 and in high school; annual determinations of adequate yearly progress for every public school and public school district in the state; dissemination of annual state and district report cards; and the implementation of choice and supplemental educational services provisions for students in schools identified for improvement under section 1116 of ESEA. Under NCLB, states must have their complete accountability systems in place by school year (SY) 2005 – 06, which corresponds to fiscal year (FY) 2006.

All states have accountability plans in place; this measure will track the number of states that have fully implemented their NCLB accountability systems prior to the mandated SY 2005 – 06 deadline.

¹ No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)

Objective 1.2: Increase flexibility and local control

Strategy

A. Flexibility provisions for state and local educational agencies

Performance Measures

Objective 1.2: Increase Flexibility and Local Control							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Local Flexibility	The percentage of school districts utilizing Local-Flex, Transferability, or Rural Flexibility.	NA	NA	NA	P	Baseline + 10 PP	Baseline + 20 PP
State Flexibility	The number of states receiving State-Flex authority (statutory maximum of seven).	NA	NA	NA	1	3	5
	The percentage of LEAs with authority under State-Flex that make AYP.	NA	NA	NA	NA	Set baseline	Baseline + 10 PP
Customer Service	The percentage of Department grantees who express satisfaction with Department customer service (responsiveness, timeliness, efficiency, etc.).	NA	NA	63*	68	67	69

* Baseline

AYP = Adequate yearly progress

LEA = Local educational agency

NA = Not available

P = Pending

PP = Percentage points

Local Flexibility

Source. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Additional Information. This measure is based on the provisions for the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP), Local Flexibility Demonstration Program (Local-Flex) and Local Transferability Provisions.

Although REAP was initially implemented under the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) in 2001, its provisions were modified under NCLB. Under NCLB, eligibility for REAP was expanded to include multiple criteria, and the programs covered by this flexibility authority were changed to encourage states and local educational agencies to apply for REAP. Because SY 2001 – 02 REAP activity was based on IASA provisions, the Department decided to collect data starting with SY 2002 – 03 (FY 2003), when regulations under NCLB were fully implemented.

The Transferability Authority was authorized under NCLB and available to districts starting with SY 2002 – 03. The baseline year for this activity is SY 2002 – 03 (FY 2003) and the data will be collected in the spring of 2004.

The Local-Flex program was authorized under NCLB and available for SY 2002 – 03, but the first recipient was not approved until the fall of 2003. The baseline year for this activity is SY 2003 – 04 (FY 2004).

State Flexibility

Sources. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, approved State-Flex plans, local report cards, program files, other records.

Additional Information. Under the State Flexibility Authority Program (State-Flex), participating states must enter into local performance agreements with 4 to 10 LEAs, at least half of which must be high poverty.

Customer Service

Source. Department of Education, Survey on Satisfaction with the U.S. Department of Education.

Objective 1.3: Increase information and options for parents

Strategies

- A. Public school parental choice and supplemental services
- B. Charter and magnet school options
- C. Parental information and involvement
- D. Development and improvement of report cards
- E. Expansion of choice options

Performance Measures

Objective 1.3: Increase Information and Options for Parents							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Parental Choice	The percentage of students in grades K - 12 who are attending a school (public or private) that their parents have chosen.	NA	NA	NA	P	20	21
	The number of children attending charter schools.	478,000	546,000	575,000	684,495	800,000	900,000
Supplemental Educational Services	Of eligible children, the percentage using supplemental educational services under the provisions of ESEA Title I.	NA	NA	NA	P*	Baseline + 5 PP	Baseline + 10 PP

* Baseline

ESEA = Elementary and Secondary Education Act

NA = Not available

P = Pending

PP = Percentage points

Parental Choice

Sources. Center for Education Reform, *National Charter School Directory*.

Department of Education, National Household Education Surveys Program.

Department of Education, Program files.

Department of Education, *State of Charter Schools 2000: Fourth-Year Report*.

Additional Information. Students included in this measure attend either a private school or a public school outside their regular attendance zone.

Supplemental Educational Services

Source. Department of Education, Title I Accountability Systems and School Improvement Efforts (TASSIE), Question D-56.

Additional Information. Eligible children are low-income children who attend a Title I school that is in its second year of school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 of ESEA. This provision went into effect September 2002 for SY 2002 – 03 (FY 2003).

Objective 1.4: Encourage the use of scientifically based methods within federal education programs

Strategies

- A. Scientifically based research
- B. Targeted support and outreach

Performance Measure

Objective 1.4: Encourage the Use of Scientifically Based Methods within Federal Education Programs							
Measure		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
What Works Clearinghouse	The number of hits on the What Works Clearinghouse Web site.	NA	NA	NA	1.5 M	2 M	2.5 M

M = Million

NA = Not available (There was no Web site.)

What Works Clearinghouse

Source. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, What Works Clearinghouse Web site, <http://www.w-w-c.org/>.

Goal 2: Improve Student Achievement

Objective 2.1: Ensure that all students read on grade level by the third grade

Strategies

- A. Early cognitive development and intervention
- B. Application and awareness of scientifically based reading research
- C. Reading achievement for special populations
- D. High-quality teacher supply and support
- E. Data-based decision-making

Performance Measures

Objective 2.1: Ensure that All Students Read on Grade Level by the Third Grade							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
State Reading Assessments	All Students. Of states with third-grade reading assessments, the percentage meeting their third-grade reading achievement targets for all students.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100
	Low-Income Students. Of states with third-grade reading assessments, the percentage meeting their third-grade reading achievement targets for low-income students.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100
	African American Students. Of states with third-grade reading assessments, the percentage meeting their third-grade reading achievement targets for African American students.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100
	Hispanic Students. Of states with third-grade reading assessments, the percentage meeting their third-grade reading achievement targets for Hispanic students.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100
	Students with Disabilities. Of states with third-grade reading assessments, the percentage meeting their third-grade reading achievement targets for students with disabilities.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100
	English Language Learners. Of states with third-grade reading assessments, the percentage meeting their third-grade reading achievement targets for English language learners.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100

NA = Not available
P = Pending

State(s) = States and jurisdictions that are required under NCLB to implement assessment systems; this includes the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

State Reading Assessments

Source. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Additional Information. Under NCLB, starting with SY 2002 – 03 (which corresponds to FY 2003), each state is required to set the same annual achievement target for all students and for several student subgroups at the grade levels it tests. States are required to test reading not less than once during grades 3 through 5; and, by FY 2006, states must test reading in each of grades 3 through 8.

These measures reflect results for only those states that have implemented third-grade reading assessments. The targets reflect the expectation that every state that has implemented its third-grade reading assessments will meet its targets. It is expected that approximately 15 states will have implemented their third-grade reading assessment by FY 2004, 25 states by FY 2005.

See also Objective 1.1 for our target related to state implementation of assessments under NCLB.

Objective 2.1: Ensure that All Students Read on Grade Level by the Third Grade							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
NAEP Reading	All Students. The percentage of all fourth-grade students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP reading assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	59	X	62	62	X	65
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	29	X	30	30	X	32
	Low-Income Students. The percentage of low-income fourth-grade students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP reading assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	39	X	46	44	X	46
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	13	X	16	15	X	17
	African American Students. The percentage of African American fourth-grade students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP reading assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	35	X	41	39	X	41
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	10	X	13	12	X	14
	Hispanic Students. The percentage of Hispanic fourth-grade students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP reading assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	36	X	45	43	X	45
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	13	X	16	14	X	16
	Students with Disabilities. The percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP reading assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	23	X	29	29	X	31
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	8	X	9	9	X	11
	Limited English Proficient Students. The percentage of fourth-grade limited English proficient students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP reading assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	18	X	24	28	X	30
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	3	X	5	7	X	9

X = Data not collected in this year

NAEP Reading

Source. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Additional Information. Data for the President's Goal that all children read by the end of the third grade are most closely approximated by data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress, an assessment that currently collects data at the fourth-grade level in reading. The NAEP data for fourth-grade reading achievement are collected biennially and are released approximately six months after the assessment. Future NAEP fourth-grade reading assessments are scheduled for 2005, 2007, and 2009.

Objective 2.2: Improve mathematics and science achievement for all students

Strategies

- A. High-quality teacher supply and support
- B. Data-based decision-making
- C. Partnerships in mathematics and science
- D. Research-based mathematics and science instruction
- E. Mathematics and science awareness and technical assistance

Performance Measures

Objective 2.2: Improve Mathematics and Science Achievement for All Students							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
State Mathematics Assessments	All Students. The percentage of states meeting their targets for middle school mathematics achievement for all students.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100
	Low-Income Students. The percentage of states meeting their targets for middle school mathematics achievement for low-income students.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100
	African American Students. The percentage of states meeting their targets for middle school mathematics achievement for African American students.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100
	Hispanic Students. The percentage of states meeting their targets for middle school mathematics achievement for Hispanic students.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100
	Students with Disabilities. The percentage of states meeting their targets for middle school mathematics achievement for students with disabilities.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100
	English Language Learners. The percentage of states meeting their targets for middle school mathematics achievement for English language learners.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100

NA = Not available
P = Pending

State(s) = States and jurisdictions that are required under NCLB to implement assessment systems; this includes the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

State Mathematics Assessments

Source. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Additional Information. Under NCLB, starting with SY 2002 – 03 (which corresponds to FY 2003), each state is required to set the same annual achievement target for all students and for several student subgroups at the grade levels it tests. States are required to test mathematics in at least one grade level from grade 6 through grade 9; and, by FY 2006, they must test mathematics at all middle school grades—grades 6, 7, and 8.

These measures reflect results for all states and jurisdictions that are required under NCLB to implement assessment systems. The targets reflect the expectation that every state and eligible jurisdiction (52) will have mathematics assessments in at least one middle school grade and will meet its targets at all tested middle school levels.

Objective 2.2: Improve Mathematics and Science Achievement for All Students							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
NAEP Mathematics	All Students. The percentage of all eighth-grade students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP mathematics assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	63	X	X	67	X	70
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	26	X	X	27	X	29
	Low-Income Students. The percentage of low-income eighth-grade students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP mathematics assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	42	X	X	47	X	49
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	10	X	X	11	X	13
	African American Students. The percentage of African American eighth-grade students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP mathematics assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	30	X	X	39	X	41
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	5	X	X	7	X	9
	Hispanic Students. The percentage of Hispanic eighth-grade students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP mathematics assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	39	X	X	47	X	49
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	8	X	X	11	X	13
	Students with Disabilities. The percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP mathematics assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	22	X	X	29	X	31
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	4	X	X	6	X	8
	Limited English Proficient Students. The percentage of eighth-grade limited English proficient students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP mathematics assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	21	X	X	26	X	28
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	2	X	X	5	X	7

X = Data not collected in this year

NAEP Mathematics

Source. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), National Assessment of Educational Progress

(NAEP).

Additional Information. The eighth-grade NAEP mathematics assessment is scheduled to be given biennially. The next assessment is scheduled for FY 2005.

Objective 2.2: Improve Mathematics and Science Achievement for All Students							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
NAEP Science	All Students. The percentage of all eighth-grade students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP science assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	59	X	X	X	X	62
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	30	X	X	X	X	32
	Low-Income Students. The percentage of low-income eighth-grade students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP science assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	33	X	X	X	X	35
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	11	X	X	X	X	13
	African American Students. The percentage of African American eighth-grade students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP science assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	24	X	X	X	X	26
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	6	X	X	X	X	8
	Hispanic Students. The percentage of Hispanic eighth-grade students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP science assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	33	X	X	X	X	35
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	10	X	X	X	X	12
	Students with Disabilities. The percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP science assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	28	X	X	X	X	30
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	8	X	X	X	X	10
	Limited English Proficient Students. The percentage of eighth-grade limited English proficient students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP science assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	12	X	X	X	X	14
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	3	X	X	X	X	5

X = Data not collected in this year

NAEP Science

Source. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Additional Information. Under the current schedule, NAEP science is administered every five years; it will next be given in FY 2005.

Objective 2.3: Improve the performance of all high school students

Strategies

- A. High school accountability
- B. Strengthened high school curricula
- C. Rigorous research on high schools
- D. Alternative high school options
- E. High-quality teacher supply and support

Performance Measures

Objective 2.3: Improve the Performance of All High School Students							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
State Reading Assessments	All Students. The percentage of states meeting their targets for high school reading achievement for all students.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100
	Low-Income Students. The percentage of states meeting their targets for high school reading achievement for low-income students.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100
	African American Students. The percentage of states meeting their targets for high school reading achievement for African American students.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100
	Hispanic Students. The percentage of states meeting their targets for high school reading achievement for Hispanic students.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100
	Students with Disabilities. The percentage of states meeting their targets for high school reading achievement for students with disabilities.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100
	English Language Learners. The percentage of states meeting their targets for high school reading achievement for English language learners.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100

NA = Not available
P = Pending

State(s) = States and jurisdictions that are required under NCLB to implement assessment systems; this includes the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

State Reading Assessments

Source. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Additional Information. Under NCLB, starting with SY 2002 – 03 (which corresponds to FY 2003), each state is required to set the same annual achievement target for all students and for several student subgroups at the grade levels it tests. States are required to test reading in at least one grade level from grade 10 through grade 12.

These measures reflect results for all states and jurisdictions that are required under NCLB to implement assessment systems. The targets reflect the expectation that every state and eligible jurisdiction (52) will have a high school reading assessment and will meet its targets.

Objective 2.3: Improve the Performance of All High School Students

Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
State Mathematics Assessments	All Students. The percentage of states meeting their targets for high school mathematics achievement for all students.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100
	Low-Income Students. The percentage of states meeting their targets for high school mathematics achievement for low-income students.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100
	African American Students. The percentage of states meeting their targets for high school mathematics achievement for African American students.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100
	Hispanic Students. The percentage of states meeting their targets for high school mathematics achievement for Hispanic students.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100
	Students with Disabilities. The percentage of states meeting their targets for high school mathematics achievement for students with disabilities.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100
	English Language Learners. The percentage of states meeting their targets for high school mathematics achievement for English language learners.	NA	NA	NA	P	100	100

NA = Not available
P = Pending

State(s) = States and jurisdictions that are required under NCLB to implement assessment systems; this includes the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

State Mathematics Assessments

Source. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Additional Information. Under NCLB, starting with SY 2002 – 03 (which corresponds to FY 2003), each state is required to set the same annual achievement target for all students and for several student subgroups at the grade levels it tests. States are required to test mathematics in at least one grade level from grade 10 through grade 12.

These measures reflect results for all states and jurisdictions that are required under NCLB to implement assessment systems. The targets reflect the expectation that every state and eligible jurisdiction (52) will have a high school mathematics assessment and will meet its targets.

Objective 2.3: Improve the Performance of All High School Students							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
NAEP Reading	All Students. The percentage of all 12th-grade students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP reading assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	X	X	72	X	X	75
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	X	X	34	X	X	36
	African American Students. The percentage of African American 12th-grade students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP reading assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	X	X	51	X	X	53
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	X	X	15	X	X	17
	Hispanic Students. The percentage of Hispanic 12th-grade students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP reading assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	X	X	58	X	X	60
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	X	X	21	X	X	23
	Students with Disabilities. The percentage of 12th-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP reading assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	X	X	31	X	X	33
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	X	X	6	X	X	8
	Limited English Proficient Students. The percentage of 12th-grade students with limited English proficiency scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP reading assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	X	X	30	X	X	32
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	X	X	5	X	X	7

X = Data not collected in this year

NAEP Reading

Source. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Additional Information. "Low-income students" are not included because the data for this subgroup are unreliable at the 12th-grade level.

Objective 2.3: Improve the Performance of All High School Students

Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
NAEP Mathematics	All Students. The percentage of all 12th-grade students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP mathematics assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	62	X	X	X	X	65
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	16	X	X	X	X	18
	African American Students. The percentage of African American 12th-grade students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP mathematics assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	29	X	X	X	X	31
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	2	X	X	X	X	4
	Hispanic Students. The percentage of Hispanic 12th-grade students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP mathematics assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	42	X	X	X	X	44
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	4	X	X	X	X	6
	Students with Disabilities. The percentage of 12th-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP mathematics assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	24	X	X	X	X	26
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	4	X	X	X	X	6
	Limited English Proficient Students. The percentage of 12th-grade students with limited English proficiency scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP mathematics assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	28	X	X	X	X	30
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	2	X	X	X	X	4

X = Data not collected in this year

NAEP Mathematics

Source. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Additional Information. "Low-income students" are not included because the data for this subgroup are unreliable at the 12th-grade level.

Objective 2.3: Improve the Performance of All High School Students

Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
NAEP Science	All Students. The percentage of all 12th-grade students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP science assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	50	X	X	X	X	53
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	17	X	X	X	X	19
	African American Students. The percentage of African American 12th-grade students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP science assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	21	X	X	X	X	23
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	3	X	X	X	X	5
	Hispanic Students. The percentage of Hispanic 12th-grade students scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP science assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	28	X	X	X	X	30
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	6	X	X	X	X	8
	Students with Disabilities. The percentage of 12th-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP science assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	17	X	X	X	X	19
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	4	X	X	X	X	6
	Limited English Proficient Students. The percentage of 12th-grade students with limited English proficiency scoring at or above the <i>Basic</i> and <i>Proficient</i> levels on the NAEP science assessment.						
	At or above <i>Basic</i>	13	X	X	X	X	15
	At or above <i>Proficient</i>	2	X	X	X	X	4

X = Data not collected in this year

NAEP Science

Source. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Additional Information. "Low-income students" are not included because the data for this subgroup are unreliable at the 12th-grade level.

Objective 2.3: Improve the Performance of All High School Students							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Advanced Placement Participation	All Students. The percentage of all 12th-grade students who took at least one of the AP exams.	12.4	13.2	14.2	14.8	16.0	17.0
	African American Students. The percentage of all 12th-grade African American students who took at least one of the AP exams.	3.9	4.1	4.5	4.9	7.0	9.0
	Hispanic Students. The percentage of all 12th-grade Hispanic students who took at least one of the AP exams.	7.4	8.1	8.9	10.0	12.0	14.0
Advanced Placement Achievement	English. The percentage of 12th-grade students who scored 3 or higher on at least one of the AP English exams.	68.8	63.4	66.4	63.5	65.5	67.5
	History. The percentage of 12th-grade students who scored 3 or higher on at least one of the AP history exams.	66.5	63.8	66.7	65.6	67.6	69.6
	Calculus. The percentage of 12th-grade students who scored 3 or higher on at least one of the AP calculus exams.	64.3	64.7	67.8	66.7	68.7	70.7
	Science. The percentage of 12th-grade students who scored 3 or higher on at least one of the AP science exams.	60.7	58.3	59.7	59.7	59.9	61.9
High School Completion	Total. The percentage of 18- to 24-year-olds who have completed high school.	86.5	86.5	P	P	87.5	88.5
	African Americans. The percentage of 18- to 24-year-old African Americans who have completed high school.	83.7	85.6	P	P	85.5	87.0
	Hispanic Americans. The percentage of 18- to 24-year-old Hispanic Americans who have completed high school.	64.1	65.7	P	P	69.0	73.0

P = Pending

Advanced Placement Participation

Sources. College Board, *Advanced Placement Program National Summary Reports*.
 Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), *Digest of Education Statistics*, 2001.
 Department of Education, NCES, *Private School Universe Survey: 1999–2000*, Table 10.
 Department of Education, NCES, *Projections of Education Statistics to 2012*, Table 3.

Additional Information. The denominator is the universe of all 12th-grade students in the United States.

Advanced Placement Achievement

Sources. College Board, *Advanced Placement Program National Summary Reports*.
 Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), *Digest of Education Statistics*, 2001.
 Department of Education, NCES, *Private School Universe Survey: 1999–2000*, Table 10.
 Department of Education, NCES, *Projections of Education Statistics to 2012*, Table 3.

Additional Information. English exams include AP English Literature and Composition and AP English Language and Composition. Calculus exams include AP Calculus AB and AP Calculus BC. Science exams include AP Biology, AP Chemistry, AP Environmental Science, AP Physics B, AP Physics C (Electricity & Magnetism), and AP Physics C (Mechanics). History exams include U.S. History, European History, and World History. The denominator reflects the universe of 12th-grade students in the United States taking AP examinations in each particular category (English, history, calculus, and science).

High School Completion

Sources. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Survey*.
 Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), *Dropout Rates in the United States*.

Additional Information. Because of small sample sizes, American Indian/Alaskan Natives and Asian/Pacific Islanders are included in the total, but no separate targets are set for these groups.

Objective 2.4: Improve teacher and principal quality

Strategies

- A. Reduced barriers to becoming a teacher or a principal
- B. Rigorous teacher preparation
- C. Research-based professional development
- D. Rigorous research on teacher quality
- E. Principal quality
- F. Retention of high-quality teachers

Performance Measure

Objective 2.4: Improve Teacher and Principal Quality							
Measure		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Highly Qualified Teachers	The percentage of the nation's teachers of core academic subjects that are "highly qualified" as defined by NCLB.	NA	NA	NA	P*	75	90

* Baseline

NA = Not available

P = Pending

Highly Qualified Teachers

Source. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Additional Information. The definition of *highly qualified teacher* from Section 9302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) will be used. NCLB requires that all teachers who are teaching core academic subjects be highly qualified by the end of SY 2005 – 06.

Objective 2.5: Improve U.S. students' knowledge of world languages, regions, and international issues and build international ties in the field of education

Strategies

- A. International partnerships
- B. International education awareness
- C. Enhanced foreign language instruction

Performance Measures

Objective 2.5: Improve U.S. Students' Knowledge of World Languages, Regions, and International Issues and Build International Ties in the Field of Education							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Foreign Language Enrollment	The percentage of public secondary school (grades 9-12) students enrolled in foreign- language courses.	NA	NA	NA	NA	43	44
Study Abroad	The number of U.S. postsecondary students studying abroad.	143,590	154,168	160,920	NA	164,000	175,000

NA = Not available

Foreign Language Enrollment

Sources. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), *Digest of Education Statistics*, 2001, Table 57. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language (ACTFL) Survey.

Study Abroad

Source. Institute of International Education, *Open Doors Survey*. www.opendoorsweb.org.

Programs Supporting Goal 2

Program Name	Plan on Web
CRA: Training and Advisory Services	Yes
ESEA: 21st Century Community Learning Centers	Yes
ESEA: Advanced Credentialing	Yes
ESEA: Advanced Placement	Yes
ESEA: Alaska Native Education Equity	Yes
ESEA: Charter Schools Grants	Yes
ESEA: Comprehensive Centers	///
ESEA: Cooperative Education Exchange	Yes
ESEA: Credit Enhancement for Charter School Facilities	Yes
ESEA: Early Childhood Educator Professional Development	Yes
ESEA: Early Reading First	Yes
ESEA: Education for Native Hawaiians	Yes
ESEA: Educational Technology State Grants	Yes
ESEA: English Language Acquisition State Grants	Yes
ESEA: Fund for the Improvement of Education Programs of National Significance	No
ESEA: Impact Aid—Basic Support Payments	Yes
ESEA: Impact Aid—Payments for Children with Disabilities	
ESEA: Impact Aid—Construction	Yes
ESEA: Impact Aid—Facilities Maintenance	No
ESEA: Impact Aid—Payments for Federal Property	No
ESEA: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants	Yes
ESEA: Indian Education—Grants to Local Educational Agencies	Yes
ESEA: Indian Education—Special Programs for Indian Children	Yes
ESEA: Literacy Through School Libraries	Yes
ESEA: Magnet Schools Assistance	Yes
ESEA: Mathematics and Science Partnerships	Yes
ESEA: Migrant State Agency Program	Yes
ESEA: National Writing Project	Yes
ESEA: Neglected and Delinquent State Agency Program	Yes
ESEA: Reading First State Grants	Yes
ESEA: Reading Is Fundamental/Inexpensive Book Distribution (FIE)	Yes
ESEA: Ready-to-Learn Television	Yes

Program Name	Plan on Web
ESEA: Rural Education Program	Yes
ESEA: State Assessments	Yes
ESEA: State Grants for Innovative Programs	Yes
ESEA: Teaching of Traditional American History	Yes
ESEA: Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies	Yes
ESEA: Transition to Teaching	Yes
ESEA: Troops-to-Teachers	Yes
ESEA: Voluntary Public School Choice	Yes
ESRA: National Assessment	Yes
ESRA: National Assessment Governing Board	No
HEA: High School Equivalency Program	Yes
HEA: Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology	No
HEA: Teacher Quality Enhancement	Yes
IDEA: Grants for Infants and Families	Yes
IDEA: Grants to States	Yes
IDEA: Parent Information Centers	Yes
IDEA: Personnel Preparation	Yes
IDEA: Preschool Grants	Yes
IDEA: State Improvement	Yes
IDEA: Technical Assistance and Dissemination	Yes
IDEA: Technology and Media Services	Yes
MVHAA: Education for Homeless Children and Youths	Yes
USC: American Printing House for the Blind	Yes
Proposed: Secondary and Technical Education State Grants	///
Striving Readers	///
Adjunct Teacher Corps Initiative	///
Military Families Initiative	///

/// = Program not currently implemented

CRA = Civil Rights Act

ESEA = Elementary and Secondary Education Act

FIE = Fund for the Improvement of Education

ESRA = Education Sciences Reform Act

HEA = Higher Education Act

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

MVHAA = McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

USC = United States Code

Program performance plans are available on the Web at <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2005plan/program.html>.

Goal 3: Develop Safe Schools and Strong Character

Objective 3.1: Ensure that our nation's schools are safe and drug free and that students are free of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs

Strategies

- A. Accountability for results
- B. Research-based strategies and effective practices
- C. Information dissemination and technical assistance

Performance Measures

Objective 3.1: Ensure That Our Nation's Schools Are Safe and Drug Free and That Students Are Free of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Violent Crime at School	The rate of violent crimes experienced at school by students ages 12-18.	26/1000	28/1000	P	P	23/1000	22/1000
	The rate of serious violent crimes experienced at school by students ages 12-18.	5/1000	6/1000	P	P	4/1000	3/1000
Drug Use	Alcohol. The percentage of youths ages 12-17 who reported using alcohol in the past 30 days.	16.4	17.3	17.6	P	14.0	13.5
	Tobacco (cigarettes). The percentage of youths ages 12-17 who reported smoking a cigarette in the past 30 days.	13.4	13.0	15.2	P	11.0	10.5
	Marijuana. The percentage of youths ages 12-17 who reported using marijuana in the past 30 days.	7.2	8.0	8.2	P	7.0	6.5

P = Pending

Violent Crime at School

Sources. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Crime Victimization Survey.
Departments of Education and Justice, *Indicators of School Crime and Safety*.

Additional Information. *Serious violent crime* includes rape, sexual assault, robbery, and aggravated assault. *Violent crime* includes serious violent crime and simple assault. These data are collected annually and are analyzed and released two years after collection.

Drug Use

Source. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, National Survey on Drug Use and Health (formerly called The National Household Survey on Drug Abuse).

Objective 3.1: Ensure That Our Nation's Schools Are Safe and Drug Free and That Students Are Free of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs

Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Substance Use at School	Alcohol. The percentage of high school students who report any alcohol use on school property in the previous 30 days.	X	5	X	P	X	4
	Cigarettes. The percentage of high school students who report any cigarette use on school property in the previous 30 days.	X	10	X	P	X	7
	Marijuana. The percentage of high school students who report any marijuana use on school property in the previous 30 days.	X	5	X	P	X	3
	Illicit Drugs. The percentage of high school students who report being offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property in the previous 12 months.	X	29	X	P	X	25

P = Pending

X = Data are not collected in this year

Substance Use at School

Source. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS).

Additional Information. These data are collected biennially and are analyzed and released one year after collection.

Objective 3.2: Promote strong character and citizenship among our nation's youth

Strategies

- A. Research-based strategies and effective practices
- B. Coordination and collaboration
- C. Information dissemination and technical assistance

Performance Measures

Objective 3.2: Promote Strong Character and Citizenship among Our Nation's Youth							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Community Service	The percentage of students in grade 12 who participate in community service or volunteer work.	75.2	77.4	NA	NA	83	84
Respect for Teachers	The percentage of students in grade 12 who would dislike it if a student intentionally did things to make his/her teachers angry.	32.1	30.6	P	P	36	38
Cheating	The percentage of students in grade 12 who think that most students in their classes would dislike it if a student cheated on a test.	12.2	13.5	P	P	19	20
	The percentage of 14- to 18-year-olds who believe cheating occurs among half or most students.	41	NA	NA	50	40	39

NA = Not available

P = Pending

Community Service

Source. University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, Monitoring the Future.

Respect for Teachers

Source. University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, Monitoring the Future.

Cheating

Sources. University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, Monitoring the Future.
Horatio Alger Association, State of America's Youth Survey.

Programs Supporting Goal 3

Program Name	Plan on Web
ESEA: Character Education (FIE)	Yes
ESEA: Civic Education: We the People	Yes
ESEA: Physical Education Program—Carol M. White (FIE)	Yes
ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities—Mentoring Program	Yes
ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities—Other National Programs	Yes
ESEA: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities—State Grants	Yes

ESEA = Elementary and Secondary Education Act

FIE = Fund for the Improvement of Education

Program performance plans are available on the Web at <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2005plan/program.html>.

Goal 4: Transform Education into an Evidence-Based Field

Objective 4.1: Raise the quality of research funded or conducted by the Department

Strategy

A. Rigorous standards for education research

Performance Measures

Objective 4.1: Raise the Quality of Research Funded or Conducted by the Department							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Quality as Judged by Independent Review	Projects. The percentage of new IES and OSEP research and evaluation projects funded by the Department to conduct research on or evaluate programs, practices, and policies designed to improve student learning and achievement that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified scientists.	NA ₁	40*	53	66	70	72
	Publications. The percentage of new IES and OSEP research and evaluation publications reporting research on or evaluation of programs, practices, and policies designed to improve student learning and achievement that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified scientists.	NA ₁	0*	100	NA ₂	95	95
Use of Randomized Experimental Designs	Projects. Of new IES and OSEP research and evaluation projects funded by the Department to conduct research on or to evaluate programs, practices, and policies designed to improve student learning and achievement, the percentage of projects addressing causal questions that employ randomized experimental designs.	NA ₁	46*	78	94	75	75
	Publications. Of new IES and OSEP research and evaluation publications reporting research on or evaluation of programs, practices, and policies designed to improve student learning and achievement, the percentage of publications addressing causal questions that describe studies that employ randomized experimental designs.	NA ₁	0*	100	NA ₂	75	75

* Baseline
IES = Institute for Education Sciences
OSEP = Office of Special Education Programs

NA₁ = Not available
NA₂ = Not applicable (There were no new publications to review.)

Quality as Judged by Independent Review

Source. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences (IES), Independent external review panels.

Additional Information. These measures include all research and evaluation studies initiated by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) and the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The independent review panel referred to here is different from the peer review panels that oversee the selection of projects. This panel is convened at the close of each fiscal year to review projects and publications after the fact as a way to judge the effectiveness of the Department's quality control mechanisms.

Use of Randomized Experimental Designs

Source. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences (IES).

Additional Information. These measures include all research and evaluation studies that address causal questions. IES researchers evaluate all newly funded research proposals. Evaluators are staff experts qualified in research and content areas. An inter-rater reliability check is done in which two researchers independently evaluate a subset of proposals and products to ensure the validity and reliability of data. An agreement factor of 96 percent minimizes threats to the validity and reliability of data.

Objective 4.2: Increase the relevance of our research in order to meet the needs of our customers

Strategies

- A. Systemic stakeholder input
- B. Responsive allocation of resources
- C. Accessible findings

Performance Measure

Objective 4.2: Increase the Relevance of Our Research in Order to Meet the Needs of Our Customers							
Measure		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Relevance as Judged by Independent Review	The percentage of new research projects funded by the Department that are deemed to be of high relevance to educational practice as determined by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners.	NA	24*	53	P	75	75

* Baseline

NA = Not available

P = Pending

Relevance as Judged by Independent Review

Source. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences (IES), Independent external review panels.

Additional Information. The independent review panel is different from peer review panels that oversee the selection of projects. This panel is convened at the close of each fiscal year to review projects and publications after the fact as a way to judge the effectiveness of the Department's quality control mechanisms.

Programs Supporting Goal 4

Program Name	Plan on Web
ESEA: Indian Education—National Activities	No
ESEA: Title I Evaluation	No
ESRA: Research, Development and Dissemination	Yes
ESRA: Statistics	Yes
IDEA: Research and Innovation	Yes
RA: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research	Yes

ESEA = Elementary and Secondary Education Act

ESRA = Education Sciences Reform Act

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

RA = Rehabilitation Act

Program performance plans are available on the Web at <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2005plan/program.html>.

Goal 5: Enhance the Quality of and Access to Postsecondary and Adult Education

Objective 5.1: Reduce the gaps in college access and completion among student populations differing by race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and disability while increasing the educational attainment of all

Strategies

- A. Rigorous academic preparation for postsecondary education
- B. Reduced barriers to postsecondary education
- C. Effective partnerships
- D. Improved services for student populations, including students with disabilities
- E. Efficient credit transfer among public institutions

Performance Measures

Objective 5.1: Reduce the Gaps in College Access and Completion among Student Populations Differing by Race/Ethnicity, Socioeconomic Status, and Disability While Increasing the Educational Attainment of All							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
College Enrollment	Percentage of 16- to 24-year-old high school graduates enrolled in college the October following high school graduation.						
	All	63.3	61.7	P	P	67.0	67.0
	White	65.7	64.2	P	P	69.4	69.4
	African American	54.9	54.6	P	P	60.8	60.8
	White–African American Gap	10.8	9.6	P	P	8.6	8.6
	Hispanic	52.9	51.7	P	P	57.5	57.6
	White–Hispanic Gap	12.8	12.5	P	P	11.9	11.8
	Low Income	49.7	43.8	P	P	51.0	52.0
	High Income	77.1	79.8	P	P	80.0	81.0
	Income Gap	27.4	36.0	P	P	29.0	29.0

P = Pending

College Enrollment

Source. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, October Current Population Survey.

Additional Information. These targets illustrate a goal of cutting the various gaps in half between FY 2002 and FY 2007.

Objective 5.1: Reduce the Gaps in College Access and Completion among Student Populations Differing by Race/Ethnicity, Socioeconomic Status, and Disability While Increasing the Educational Attainment of All

Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
College Graduation (Four-Year Institutions)	The percentage of full-time, bachelor's degree-seeking students who graduate within six years.						
	All	52.4	P	P	P	54.0	55.0
	White	55.4	P	P	P	56.8	57.4
	African American	35.7	P	P	P	37.4	38.3
	White–African American Gap	19.7	P	P	P	19.4	19.1
	Hispanic	41.5	P	P	P	43.2	44.3
	White–Hispanic Gap	13.9	P	P	P	13.6	13.1
Completions (Two-Year Institutions)	The percentage of full-time degree- or certificate-seeking students who graduate, earn a certificate, or transfer from two-year institutions within three years.						
	All	32.7	P	P	P	34.0	35.0
	White	34.0	P	P	P	34.5	35.4
	African American	26.5	P	P	P	27.3	28.3
	White–African American Gap	7.5	P	P	P	7.2	7.1
	Hispanic	30.1	P	P	P	31.1	32.2
	White–Hispanic Gap	3.9	P	P	P	3.4	3.2
TRIO Participant Enrollment in College	Percentage of TRIO students who achieve their goal of enrolling in postsecondary education after exiting the program.						
	Weighted Average	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	66
	Talent Search	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	74
	Educational Opportunity Centers	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	52.5
	Upward Bound	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	65

NA = Not available

P = Pending

College Graduation; Completions

Source. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), Graduation Rate Survey (GRS) as part of the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

Additional Information. These targets illustrate a goal of cutting the various gaps in half from FY 2002 to FY 2007.

TRIO Participant Enrollment in College

Source. TRIO Program Performance Reports.

Objective 5.2: Strengthen accountability of postsecondary education institutions

Strategies

- A. Enhanced monitoring and reporting
- B. Data-based decision-making
- C. Improved discretionary grant process
- D. Outcomes-based performance management
- E. Comprehensive information for parents and students

Performance Measures

Objective 5.2: Strengthen Accountability of Postsecondary Education Institutions							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Report Submission	The percentage of states and territories submitting HEA Title II reports with all data reported using federally-required definitions.	NA	63*	80	83	91	94
Institutional Reporting	The percentage of institutions of higher education submitting required reports and information on time.						
	Audit data	NA	NA	NA	NA	99	99
	Campus crime data	NA	NA	NA	NA	100	100
	IPEDS data	NA	NA	NA	NA	99	99
ED Grant Closeout	The percentage of OPE grants that are closed on time.	NA	NA	NA	NA	90	95
ED Audit Resolution	The percentage of IG and GAO audits of OPE activities that are resolved on time.	NA	NA	NA	NA	75	80

*Baseline

GAO = General Accounting Office

HEA = Higher Education Act

IG = Inspector General

IPEDS = Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System

NA = Not available

OPE = Office of Postsecondary Education

Report Submission

Sources. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), HEA Title II Data System.
Department of Education, *The Secretary's Annual Report on Teacher Quality*.

Institutional Reporting; ED Grant Closeout; ED Audit Resolution

Source. Department of Education, Administrative and Program Records.

Objective 5.3: Establish effective funding mechanisms for postsecondary education

Strategies

- A. Knowledge management for student aid
- B. Student aid award accuracy

Performance Measures

Objective 5.3: Establish Effective Funding Mechanisms for Postsecondary Education							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
College Tuition	Average national increase in college tuition in percentage, adjusted for inflation.	4.5	3.1	6.4	P	5.0	4.0
Borrower Indebtedness	Borrower indebtedness (expressed as average borrower payments) for federal student loans as a percentage of borrower income.	6.4	NA	P	NA	9.9	9.9

NA = Not available

P = Pending

College Tuition

Sources. College Board (for October data).

Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS) collected through IES (for December data).

Borrower Indebtedness

Sources. Department of Education, federal loan records from the National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS).
Internal Revenue Service (IRS), income data.

Objective 5.4: Strengthen Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-Serving Institutions, and Tribal Colleges and Universities

Strategies

- A. Improved technical assistance
- B. Targeted services for improved access, persistence, and completion
- C. Public/private partnerships
- D. Strengthened technological infrastructure

E. Strengthened fiscal management

Performance Measures

Objective 5.4: Strengthen Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-Serving Institutions, and Tribal Colleges and Universities							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Fiscal Balance	The percentage of HBCUs, HSIs, and TCUs with a positive fiscal balance.	67	71	69	P	70	71
Technological Capacity	The percentage of HBCUs, HSIs, and TCUs with evidence of increased technological capacity (such as wireless systems, high-speed Internet connections, distance learning programs, or other evidence of technological innovation).	NA	NA	NA	P	50	52.5

HBCUs = Historically Black Colleges and Universities

HSIs = Hispanic-Serving Institutions

NA = Not available

P = Pending

TCUs = Tribal Colleges and Universities

Fiscal Balance

Source. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

Additional Information. Data are self-reported from institutions and estimate the total universe in this indicator. Nearly all HBCUs, HSIs, and TCUs participate in the IPEDS Financial Report and are, therefore, represented by the data. An institution's status as an HSI is determined by Hispanic and low-income student enrollment, which can fluctuate from year to year and cannot be exactly determined from IPEDS enrollment data. However, a reasonable approximation can be based on the IPEDS enrollment data.

Technological Capacity

Source. Department of Education, OPE Program Performance Reports.

Objective 5.5: Enhance the literacy and employment skills of American adults

Strategies

- A. Accountability for state and local results
- B. Research-based strategies and effective practices
- C. Demonstration projects, information dissemination, and technical assistance
- D. Technology-based solutions

Performance Measures

Objective 5.5: Enhance the Literacy and Employment Skills of American Adults							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Employment of Individuals with Disabilities	The percentage of employed individuals served by state VR agencies who obtain competitive employment.	NA	NA	NA	NA	63.2	63.4
Adult Learning Outcomes	The percentage of adults in adult basic education programs who acquire the level of basic skills (validated by standardized assessments) needed to complete the level of instruction in which they enrolled.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	42
	The percentage of adults enrolled in English literacy programs who acquire the level of English language skills (validated by standardized assessments) needed to complete the level of instruction in which they enrolled.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	45
	The percentage of adult education participants who achieve their goal of earning a high school diploma or its recognized equivalent.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	45
	The percentage of adult education participants who achieve their goal of enrolling in postsecondary education or training after exiting the program.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	30
	The percentage of adult education participants who achieve their goal of finding employment after exiting the program.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	40

* Baseline

NA = Not available

VR = Vocational rehabilitation

Employment of Individuals with Disabilities

Source. Department of Education, Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA), 911 Case Services Report.

Adult Learning Outcomes

Source. Department of Education, OVAE Program Performance Reports.

Objective 5.6: Increase the capacity of U.S. postsecondary education institutions to teach world languages, area studies, and international issues

Strategies

- A. Strengthened foreign language, international, and area studies capacity
- B. Effective partnerships and linkages

Performance Measures

Objective 5.6: Increase the Capacity of U.S. Postsecondary Educational Institutions to Teach World Languages, Area Studies, and International Issues							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
International Postsecondary Consortia	The percentage of international postsecondary consortia projects that are institutionalized after the conclusion of the grant period.	NA	NA	NA	P	44	46
Course Offerings	The number of foreign-language course offerings by Title VI institutions.	NA	NA	NA	NA	Set baseline	20,000
Employment	The percentage of Title VI graduates who find employment in higher education, government service, and national security.	NA	NA	NA	NA	Set baseline	50
Instructional Materials	The number of comprehensive instructional resources (assessments, publications, curricular materials, etc.) produced at Title VI institutions of higher education.	NA	NA	NA	NA	Set baseline	90
Teacher Training	The number of K-12 teachers trained through the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays Programs.	NA	NA	NA	NA	Set baseline	5,000

NA = Not available

P = Pending

International Postsecondary Consortia

Sources. Department of Education, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, Program Data.
Department of Education, Office of International Education, Program Data.

Course Offerings, Employment, Instructional Materials, and Teacher Training

Source. Department of Education, Office of International Education, Program Data.

Programs Supporting Goal 5

Program Name	Plan on Web
AEFLA: Adult Basic and Literacy Education State Grants	Yes
AEFLA: Adult Education National Leadership Activities	Yes
AEFLA: National Institute for Literacy	Yes
ATA: Assistive Technology	Yes
DOEAA: GPRA Data/HEA Program Evaluation	No
EDA: Gallaudet University	Yes
EDA: National Technical Institute for the Deaf	Yes
HEA: AID—Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions	Yes
HEA: AID—Minority Science and Engineering Improvement	
HEA: AID—Strengthening Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions	
HEA: AID—Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities	
HEA: AID—Strengthening Historically Black Graduate Institutions	
HEA: AID—Strengthening Institutions (Part A)	
HEA: AID—Strengthening Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities	
HEA: Byrd Honors Scholarships	Yes
HEA: Child Care Access Means Parents In School	Yes
HEA: College Assistance Migrant Program	Yes
HEA: Federal TRIO programs—Educational Opportunity Centers	Yes
HEA: Federal TRIO programs—McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement	Yes
HEA Federal TRIO programs—Student Support Services	Yes
HEA: Federal TRIO programs—Talent Search	Yes
HEA: Federal TRIO programs—Upward Bound	Yes
HEA: Federal TRIO programs—Other	No
HEA: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education	Yes
HEA: Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP)	Yes
HEA: Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN)	Yes
HEA: Historically Black College and University (HBCU) Capital Financing—Federal Administration	No
HEA: Interest Subsidy Grants	No

Program Name	Plan on Web
HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies—Domestic Programs	Yes
HEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies—Institute for International Public Policy	
MECEA: International Education and Foreign Language Studies—Overseas Programs	
HEA: Javits Fellowships	Yes
HEA/DEOA: SFA—Student Aid Administration	
HEA: SFA—College Housing and Academic Facilities Loans (CHAFL) Federal Administration	
HEA: SFA—Federal Direct Student Loans	Yes
HEA: SFA—Federal Family Education Loan Program & Liquidating	
HEA: SFA—Federal Pell Grants	
HEA: SFA—Federal Perkins Loans	
HEA: SFA—Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants	
HEA: SFA—Federal Work-Study	
HKNCA: Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults	Yes
Howard University	Yes
RA: Client Assistance State Grants	Yes
RA: Evaluation	No
RA: Independent Living—Centers	Yes
RA: Independent Living—Services for Older Blind Individuals	Yes
RA: Independent Living—State Grants	Yes
RA: Protection and Advocacy	Yes
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Demonstration and Training Programs	Yes
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Program Improvement	No
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants—Grants for Indians	Yes
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants—Grants to States	Yes
RA: Vocational Rehabilitation Training	Yes
VTEA: Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational and Technical Institute	Yes
Enhanced Pell Grants for State Scholars	///

/// = Program not currently implemented

AEFLA = Adult Education and Family Literacy Act

ATA = Assistive Technology Act

DOEAA = Department of Education Appropriations Act

EDA = Education of the Deaf Act

HEA = Higher Education Act

AID = Aid for Institutional Development

SFA = Student Financial Assistance programs

HKNCA = Helen Keller National Center Act

MECEA = Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961

RA = Rehabilitation Act

VTEA = Vocational and Technical Education Act

Program performance plans are available on the Web at <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2005plan/program.html>.

Goal 6: Establish Management Excellence throughout the Department of Education

Objective 6.1: Develop and maintain financial integrity and management and internal controls

Strategies

- A. Financial systems integration
- B. Management decisions based on enhanced financial analysis
- C. Outcome-based stewardship of federal funds
- D. Optimal use of performance-based initiatives

Performance Measures

Objective 6.1: Develop and Maintain Financial Integrity and Management and Internal Controls							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Audit Opinion	The achievement of an unqualified audit opinion.	Qualified	Qualified	Unqualified	Unqualified	Unqualified	Unqualified
Open Audit Recommendations	The number of audit recommendations from prior-year financial statement audits remaining open.	18	19	8	3	2	2
Performance-Based Contracts	The percentage of performance-based contract actions.	NA	NA	44	45	45	45
	The percentage of eligible dollars in performance-based contract actions.	43	52	59	60	60	60
Erroneous Payments	The percentage of erroneous payments.	NA	NA	NA	2.5 [#]	Less than 2.5	Less than 2.5
Cost Per Transaction	The federal administrative cost per discretionary grant transaction.	NA	NA	NA	\$8,128 [*]	\$8,128	TBD based on trend data
	The federal administrative cost per formula grant transaction.	NA	NA	NA	\$4,065 [*]	\$4,065	TBD based on trend data
Reconciliations	Timeliness of major account reconciliations, expressed as number of days after month-end.	NA	NA	NA	NA	30	30

* Baseline

NA = Not available

Benchmark

TBD = To be determined

Audit Opinion

Source. Ernst & Young, Report of Independent Auditors.

Open Audit Recommendations

Source. Department of Education, Audit Accountability and Resolution Tracking System (AARTS).

Performance-Based Contracts

Source. Department of Education, Education Central Automated Processing System (EDCAPS) and Federal Procurement Data Source (FPDS).

Erroneous Payments

Source. Department of Education, Internal data.

Additional Information. The 2.5 target is the benchmark established by OMB.

Cost Per Transaction

Source. Department of Education, Internal data.

Additional Information. During FY 2004, the Department intends to benchmark the methodologies used by other agencies to calculate cost of grant awards. These benchmarking efforts may result in future changes to the Department's calculation methodology.

Reconciliations

Source. Department of Education, Internal data.

Additional Information. Timely reconciliations are critical to meeting the accelerated audit schedule and for using financial data in making day-to-day business decisions.

Objective 6.2: Improve the strategic management of the Department's human capital

Strategies

- A. Human capital planning
- B. Skills gap analysis
- C. Emphasis on customer service and employee performance and accountability
- D. Human capital management core process improvements
- E. Strategic sourcing

Performance Measures

Objective 6.2: Improve the Strategic Management of the Department's Human Capital							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Skills Gap Reduction	The percentage of principal offices that have identified recruitment needs in their principal office recruitment plan.	NA	NA	NA	89	95	95
	The percentage of principal offices that are taking actions to fill critical positions with needed skills.	NA	NA	NA	P	60	70
Alignment Between High Performance and Awards	The percentage of performance, cash, and time-off awards that are given to employees with ratings in the top three rating levels in the EDPAS system.	NA	NA	NA	100	100	100
Addressing Poor Performers	The percentage of personnel in the lowest two EDPAS rating levels who have performance improvement activities under way.	NA	NA	NA	55	70	80
Managers' Use of Performance Appraisal System	The percentage of EDPAS employees who have documented ratings of record in FPPS within 90 days of the close of the rating cycle.	NA	NA	NA	86 ²	80	90
Strategic Sourcing	The number of business functions reviewed for strategic sourcing.	NA	NA	NA	9	8	9

NA = Not applicable
P = Pending

EDPAS = Education Department Performance Appraisal System
FPPS = Federal Personnel Payroll System

Skills Gap Reduction

Source. Department of Education, Office of Management, Recruitment Plans.

Alignment

Source. Department of Education, Office of Management, Federal Personnel Payroll System (FPPS) and Education Department Performance Appraisal System (EDPAS).

Addressing Poor Performers

Source. Department of Education, Office of Management, FPPS, Employee Relations Team, and EDPAS.

Managers' Use of Performance Appraisal System

Source. Department of Education, Office of Management, FPPS.

Strategic Sourcing

Source. Department of Education, Office of the Chief Financial Officer.

² The performance measure for FY 2003 did not specify a period of time in which employees would have ratings of records. The 86 percent figure was calculated approximately 150 days after the close of the rating cycle.

Objective 6.3: Manage information technology resources, using e-gov, to improve services for our customers and partners

Strategies

- A. Implementation of an enterprise architecture
- B. Secure IT infrastructure
- C. Reduction of data-reporting burden
- D. Customer-oriented online business focus

Performance Measures

Objective 6.3 Manage Information Technology Resources, Using E-Gov, to Improve Services for Our Customers and Partners							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Online Capability	The percentage of grant programs providing online application capability.	5	20	29	57	65	75
System Security	The percentage of currently identified Tier 1 and Tier 2 systems that complete Certification and Accreditation.	NA	NA	NA	10	50	100
	The percentage of completed FISMA Plan of Actions and Milestones (POA&M).	NA	NA	NA	53	55	60
IT Investments	The percentage of major IT investments that achieve less than a 10% variance of cost goals.	NA	NA	94.4	P	91	92
	The percentage of major IT investments that achieve less than a 10% variance of schedule goals.	NA	NA	83.3	P	91	92

FISMA = Federal Information Security Management Act

NA = Not applicable

P = Pending

Online Capability

Source. Department of Education, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Program files.

System Security

Source. Department of Education, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Program files.

IT Investments

Source. Department of Education, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Earned Value Management System Workbook.

Objective 6.4: Modernize the Student Financial Assistance programs and reduce their high-risk status

Strategies

- A. Integrated and efficient processes and delivery system
- B. Program integrity

Performance Measures

Objective 6.4: Modernize the Student Financial Assistance Programs and Reduce Their High-Risk Status							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Leave High-Risk List	Student Financial Assistance (SFA) programs will leave the General Accounting Office (GAO) high-risk list and will not return.	NA	NA	94% of Plan accomplished.	i. Clean opinion was received. ii. SFA programs remain on the GAO high-risk list.	i. Clean opinion. ii. Address internal audit recommendations meeting the 95% standard. iii. Meet program integration goals in the FY 2004 FSA Performance Plan.	Not be designated a High-Risk Program in GAO's High-Risk Series Report issued January 2005.
Recovery Rate	Default recovery rate (percentage of FSA's collections excluding consolidations).	7.5	7.8	7.6	9.5	9.5	10
	Overall default recovery rate (percentage of FSA's and GA's collections, excluding consolidations).	NA	NA	NA	NA	11.0	11.5
Pell Grant Erroneous Payments	The percentage of Pell grant overpayments.	NA	3.4	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.1
	The percentage of Pell grant underpayments.	NA	NA	NA	NA	1.8	1.8
	The percentage of Pell grant erroneous payments.	NA	NA	NA	4.9	4.9	4.9
Financial Management	Timeliness of FSA major system reconciliations to the general ledger, expressed as the number of days after month-end close.	NA	NA	45 days	Oct – Mar: 35 days Apr – Sept: 24 days	30 days	30 days
	Number of material weaknesses and reportable conditions reported in financial statement audits.	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	0

Objective 6.4: Modernize the Student Financial Assistance Programs and Reduce Their High-Risk Status (continued)

Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Customer Service	Customer service level for FAFSA on the Web.	NA	NA	NA	86	86	86
	Customer service level for Direct Loan Servicing.	NA	NA	NA	77	77	77
	Customer service level for Common Origination and Disbursement (COD).	NA	NA	NA	66	70	74
	Customer service level for Lender Reporting System (LaRS).	NA	NA	NA	71	74	74
Integration of Systems	Integration of FSA processes and systems that work together to support FSA program delivery functions.	NA	NA	Met 100% of FY 2002 integration targets.	Met 100% of FY 2003 targets in FSA's sequencing plan and reevaluated targets for 2004-2007.	100% of FY 2004 targets in FSA's sequencing plan.	100% of FY 2005 targets in FSA's sequencing plan.

FAFSA = Free Application for Federal Student Aid
FSA = Office of Federal Student Aid
GA = Guaranty Agency

GAO = General Accounting Office
NA = Not available
SFA = Student Financial Assistance (programs)

Leave High-Risk List

Sources. Department of Education, Office of Federal Student Aid (FSA) High-Risk Plan.
Department of Education, FSA Progress Reports.
General Accounting Office (GAO), High-Risk List.

Recovery Rate

Source. Department of Education, Debt Collection Management Systems (DCMS) Management Information System (MIS) reports.
Additional Information. Defined as the sum of FSA's collections on defaulted loans—less consolidation—divided by the outstanding default portfolio at the end of the previous year, expressed as a percentage.

Pell Grant Erroneous Payments

Source. Department of Education and Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Analysis of sampled IRS income data to data reported on the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) reported by FSA and Recipient Financial Management System.

Financial Management

Source. Department of Education, Office of Federal Student Aid (FSA), Internal System Reports.

Customer Service

Source. Department of Education, FSA, American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) Survey.

Integration of Systems

Source. Department of Education, FSA Progress Reports.

Objective 6.5: Achieve budget and performance integration to link funding decisions to results

Strategies

- A. Aligned budget and planning processes
- B. Program effectiveness documentation

Performance Measures

Objective 6.5: Achieve Budget and Performance Integration to Link Funding Decisions to Results							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Program Effectiveness	The percentage of Department program dollars associated with programs reviewed under the PART process that demonstrate effectiveness.	NA	NA	55	P	56	57
Program Performance Information	The percentage of Department program dollars associated with programs reviewed under the PART process that are rated "Results Not Demonstrated" for more than two years.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Less than 50

NA = Not available

P = Pending

PART = Program Assessment Rating Tool

PART analysis began in 2002 and is conducted annually. Results become available in February of each year, with the release of the President's Budget. In February 2003, the Department completed PART reviews of 18 programs. By February 2004, the Department will have completed PART reviews of 33 programs.

Program Effectiveness

Source. Department of Education, Analysis of PART scores.

Additional Information. The Department bases these measures on programs that are reviewed by OMB under the PART. The Department defines effective programs as those ranked effective, moderately effective, or adequate through the PART process. The measure compares the appropriation for the effective programs to the appropriation for all programs that were reviewed under the PART. For FY 2005 the data will reflect FY 2005 appropriations and programs that had PART reviews conducted during or prior to FY 2005. Appropriation amounts include only program budget authority and exclude salaries and expenses budget authority.

Program Performance Information

Source. Department of Education, Analysis of PART scores.

Additional Information. This measure aligns with that established for the President's Management Agenda (PMA) Scorecard. The PMA standard for a "yellow" score is less than 50 percent of PART programs rated as "Results Not Demonstrated" for more than two years. This measure compares the appropriation for programs rated "Results Not Demonstrated" to the appropriation for all programs that were reviewed under PART. For FY 2005, data will reflect FY 2005 appropriations and programs that had PART reviews conducted during or prior to FY 2005. The first PART analyses were released in February 2003. The first results for this measure (a three-year trend) will be available for FY 2005.

Objective 6.6: Leverage the contributions of faith-based and community organizations to increase the effectiveness of Department programs

Strategies

- A. Enhanced technical assistance and outreach for faith-based and community organizations
- B. Full participation of faith-based and community organizations in Department programs

Performance Measures

Objective 6.6: Leverage the Contributions of Faith-Based and Community Organizations to Increase the Effectiveness of Department Programs							
Measures		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Technical Assistance	The number of FBCOs who receive technical assistance concerning programs amenable to their participation through the Web site, attendance at a workshop, telephonic consultation, direct meeting, or receipt of materials.	NA	NA	NA	NA	10,000	15,000
	The percentage of programs amenable to participation by FBCOs in which novice applicant reform is implemented.	NA	NA	62	100	100	100
Grant Applications	The number of grant applications from FBCOs for federal discretionary grant programs.	NA	NA	NA	P*	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%
	The percentage of FBCOs that successfully apply for federal discretionary grants programs.	NA	NA	NA	NA	The success rate for FBCOs will be within 10% of non-FBCOs.	The success rate for FBCOs will be within 5% of non-FBCOs.
Providers	Number of FBCOs approved by states as supplemental educational service providers under NCLB.	NA	NA	NA	22	90	125

* Baseline

FBCOs = Faith-Based and Community Organizations

NA = Not applicable

P = Pending

Technical Assistance

Sources. "Community Technology Center," Federal Register, Vol. 68, no. 119 (June 20, 2003): 37059.
 "Carol M. White Physical Education," Federal Register, Vol. 68, no. 62 (April 1, 2003): 15912.
 "Early Reading First," Federal Register, Vol. 68, no. 47 (March 11, 2003).
 "PIRC Grant," Federal Register, Vol. 68, no. 131 (July 9, 2003): 40913–40914.

Grant Applications

Source. Department of Education, Office of the Secretary, Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

Providers

Source. Department of Education, Office of the Secretary, Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

Objective 6.7: By becoming a high-performance, customer-focused organization, earn the President's Quality Award.

Performance Measure

Objective 6.7: By Becoming a High-Performance, Customer-Focused Organization, Earn the President's Quality Award							
Measure		Performance Data				Performance Targets	
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
President's Quality Award	Earn the President's Quality Award.	NA	NA	Department applied for the award and gained insight.	Department applied for the award and gained insight.	Apply for and win the award.	If we do not win the FY 2004 award, apply for and win the award.

NA = Not applicable

Source: Department of Education, Office of Personnel Management (OPM), Application materials.

Additional Information. If the Department wins the award in FY 2004, we cannot apply in FY 2005.